

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

BRADLEY MARSHALL, ) Case No. CV-11-5319 SC  
 )  
Plaintiff, ) ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO  
 ) STRIKE  
v. )  
 )  
WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, )  
et al., )  
 )  
Defendants. )  
 )  
 )  
 )

---

Now before the Court are motions for judgment on the pleadings brought by Defendants in the above captioned matter. ECF Nos. 52 ("WSBA Mot."), 53 ("State Defs.' Mot."). Plaintiff filed an opposition and Defendants filed reply briefs. ECF Nos. 57 ("Opp'n"), 59 ("State Defs.' Reply"), 60 ("WSBA Reply"). Plaintiff has also filed a surreply, ECF No. 61, sparking the parties to file an impressive number of additional motions. Defendants filed an objection and motions to strike the surreply. ECF Nos. 63, 65. Plaintiff filed a response and a motion to strike Defendants' motions to strike. ECF No. 64, 66. Defendants filed an opposition to Marshall's motion to strike. ECF No. 67. And, most recently, Plaintiff filed a reply in support of his motion to strike. ECF

1 No. 70.

2 In light of the fact that the Court granted the parties leave  
3 to file over-sized briefs, this additional and often repetitive  
4 briefing is wasteful. Further, it appears that all of the parties  
5 have violated various local rules in the process. Nevertheless,  
6 the Court will review and consider all arguments submitted.  
7 Accordingly, the various motions to strike filed by the parties are  
8 DENIED. The parties are to cease filing additional briefing on  
9 Defendants' motions for judgment on the pleadings and the Court  
10 warns the parties to follow the proper procedures prior to filing  
11 additional briefing in the future.

12  
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14  
15 Dated: March 14, 2012

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE